



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,894	07/24/2003	Gopalakrishnapillai Sankaramangalam Vinod Kumar	31446-191297	1189
26694	7590	11/23/2005	EXAMINER	
VENABLE LLP			TESKIN, FRED M	
P.O. BOX 34385			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20045-9998			1713	

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/625,894

Applicant(s)

KUMAR ET AL.

Examiner

Fred M. Teskin

Art Unit

1713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 14-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Applicant's election of the invention of Group I, claims 1-4, in the reply filed on July 29, 2005, is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). New claims 14-18, being drawn to the elected invention, will be examined together with claims 1-4.

Claims 5-13 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on July 29, 2005.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: (i) the abbreviations "CCME", "ACP", "HOBT", "HBTU" and "DIEA" should be defined at their first occurrences in the specification (see, page 4, final paragraph; page 6, final paragraph and page 7, line 5); and (ii) the expression "weight below 1Lacks" (see page 6, line 14) is not understood. Clarification and appropriate correction of the specification is required.

Claims 1-4 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the following grounds for indefiniteness apply to the indicated claims.

(A) Claims 1, 2 and 4 are indefinite as of indeterminate scope in the expressions "optimum hydrophilic/hydrophobic balances", "high coupling efficiency" and "vigorous ... conditions". The terms "optimum", "high" and "vigorous" are relative terms that are not defined in the claims, and the specification merely repeats the same terms without providing any standard for ascertaining the requisite balances, level of coupling efficiency and synthetic conditions intended to be embraced thereby. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

(B) Claim 14 is confusing in expressing a "ratio" as a percent, i.e., 1.9% (see, final line). Mathematically, a ratio has no units. Moreover, it is unclear how the ratio is to be calculated when determining whether or not the claim is infringed; i.e., it is unclear which component of the polymerization system the stabilizer ratio is to be based on. Clarification and appropriate correction are required.

(C) Claims 15 and 16 are confusing and inaccurate in referring to the "polymer as claimed in claim 5", as this (non-elected) claim is plainly directed to a process.

(D) Claim 18, which currently depends from claim 1, provides the limitation to "the step of hydrazinolysis". There is no antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 1713

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Arunan et al is relevant to solid-phase peptide synthesis using a crosslinked polystyrene resin prepared with 1,6-hexanediol diacrylate crosslinker and subsequently functionalized with chloromethyl methyl ether. Crosslinking with hexanediol *propoxylate* diacrylate to provide a polymer support comprising *propoxylate* function of hexanedioldiacrylate crosslinks, as here claimed, is not taught or suggested.

Main is relevant to polymer supports comprising polyoxalkylene chains attached to a crosslinked polymer. The use of hexanediol propoxylate diacrylate as crosslinking monomer is not taught or suggested.


Claims 1-4 and 14-18 are free of the prior art of record. Examiner has not, as of the date of this Office action, located or identified any prior art document(s) that can be used to render the polymer support defined by said claims anticipated or obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner F. M. Teskin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM, and can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

Art Unit: 1713

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


FRED TESKIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
1713

FMTeskin/09-18-05